

freshmen, and waiters' jobs were reserved for the varsity.

You could sometimes get Saturday jobs weeding onions or washing windows; and when the weather came right for stripping tobacco, whole squads of us would take off from classes to earn \$1.50 a day.

But a room was \$1.50 a week and you could get a double order of mashed potatoes at the college cafeteria for 6 cents, breakfast of muffins and oatmeal for 8 cents. There were always apples, and a box of food from home; or sometimes \$5 in a letter—when they had it to spare—would eke out suppers of bread and cheese and bologna.

I still have a tiny account book of my expenditures that year, \$243.50. Next year I got a job and a room in the experiment station, running the addressograph machine for farmers' bulletins. The hourly pay went up to 20 cents. College was easy from then on.

Junior year I could eat at the training table with the track team. Our farm boys made rugged teams and they made sturdy citizens. Our agricultural graduates of that time made a corps of the progressive farmers of the State developers of farm cooperatives, leaders in community affairs, and some of them county agents, some school principals, some businessmen, some in the legislature and other public service.

The old college was a seedbed of good solid citizenship. They'd all learned how to make a useful living, exploiting the land and not other people. The salt of the earth for my money, as I've known them down the years.

The college in 1914 was a glorious place to be. To a lad from the scrublands of Plymouth County, the broad sweep of the Connecticut Valley, its fertile fields, its lovely woods (we still had the chestnuts) made it indeed "the fairest intervale."

The campus was spacious, spreading around a pond out to open fields and up through a wooded hillside, with the college forest on Mt. Tobey, a few miles north. Oh, forestry was another career field, popular in my day. The college had space to grow and it has grown magnificently. It still has space, the envy of the city colleges, hemmed in by traffic and urban land costs. It is the site of the future.

But even in its earliest days the Agricultural College had stature. Its earliest work in science won acclaim from Agassiz. Its very first class won a crew race over Harvard and Brown on the Connecticut River. The victorious 1870 shell still hung in the old Social Union 45 years later.

The core curriculum required of sophomores in my day included physics, zoology, and agronomy, taught by three formidable scientists and known as the toughest courses in college. The cultural side was undoubtedly limited, for what stands out as the most civilizing influence I encountered was a French course under Alexander MacKimmie. But a great teacher can make of any course an inspiration.

Ray Torrey in a course in botany opened the world of science and thought to boys from small high schools, broadened and deepened their lives.

Literature was scant. But Dean Edward M. Lewis, later president, lectured on Browning with unforgettable eloquence. He also batted out flies to the baseball team.

Frank Prentice Rand and Walter Prince taught English, coached dramatics and guided student publications with an enthusiasm worth a battery. They have the batteries now in all those fields and are getting increased legislative support, which came later and less than in our neighbor States.

For the college was long overshadowed by the historic concentration of private colleges in Massachusetts and was limited by conservative State policy until after the Second World War. Then two forces joined for expansion. The GI bill brought a host of mature students who could not be denied;

which required using Fort Devens as a temporary annex.

This emergency led Governor Tobin to ask President James B. Conant of Harvard to head a committee to plan a program for the university. It was Conant who charted its larger role and convinced the legislature. I sat in on some of that with him and know how much the University of Massachusetts owes to this vigorous supporter of public education.

The future of our university is what we make it in Massachusetts. It should be great. The State needs it. It must be as strong in all fields as any comparable institution, to graduate people adequate for any task of useful pursuit in our modern society. Nothing less will serve.

It will have to take much of the pressure for rapid growth that our rising college population impose. To do this without diluting its strength calls for toughness of administration. For its standards will count more in Massachusetts than those of our great private institutions of national reach. These standards should be applied also to the whole group of our State colleges (formerly normal schools) so that a Massachusetts college diploma will have full value, wherever granted.

The University of Connecticut had branches in the principal cities to make higher education accessible throughout the State. The University of California has half a dozen campuses. Michigan, Iowa, Tennessee are among the States that each have two great State universities.

The University of Massachusetts, as it grows to meet the needs of the State, should coordinate all the publicly supported institutions of higher learning into one system that will insure the full values of education in each and a full range of educational needs.

The university will inevitably develop as a center of research to meet the special needs of Massachusetts. It should swiftly develop a communications center around an educational television station. Its extension service in agriculture makes a ready nucleus for educational extension of every sort out to the smallest community.

The needs of public service call for the utmost effort in everything that concerns politics and public life, through education, planning, conference, organization, leadership. The whole range of adult education invites imaginative development.

There's a wide field for informal seminars and nondegree offerings that adults can attend for longer or shorter periods to strengthen their own professional work. Examples are to be found at Rutgers in journalism, at Harvard in several fields, at M.I.T. and a few other places. But there's exceedingly little of it and a great chance for it.

With adequate support and leadership, the university in its second century can and should be a vitalizing force for every institution and community in Massachusetts.

[From the Greenfield (Mass.) Recorder-Gazette, May 1, 1963]

ONE HUNDRED YEARS YOUNGER

The University of Massachusetts is 100 years younger than it was in 1863; younger, in fact, than it ever has been and younger than anyone could have conceived when its charter was granted.

The university is young, not only in appearance but also in spirit, management and point of view. This institution observing its centennial year has become younger in the past decade than it has been in all the 90 years preceding.

Youth at the University of Massachusetts is manifested in so many phases of college life that it would be difficult to single out any particular aspect as characteristic.

There are far more new, elegant, practical and impressive new buildings at the university today than at any time since it was founded. There are more students roaming the campus, occupying desks and participating in university advantages than even the most optimistic eye could foresee in 1863. There are more courses, a greater variety of talents and better facilities offered today than in all of the 100 years past.

Youth, however, is typified by the view of the future. The University of Massachusetts is engaged in a program of expansion which will place it at the head of similar institutions all over the country. And it won't take long to achieve this goal. Already it has become a community in itself.

Buildings do not a college make, however, and the true quality of institutions of this type is measured in terms of the product. The university in its earlier years was known primarily for its agricultural interests and the young farmers it turned out. Massachusetts Aggie was the old familiar cliché of that earlier era. Now it dispenses farming techniques along with science, engineering, the arts and the latest in every phase of contemporary and future prosperity.

The year 2063 is destined to produce many more changes in university life, needs and equipment. There will be structures dwarfing those of 1963. There will be courses which today have not even been imagined. It may be teaching youngsters how to cultivate the moon or how to set up factories on Mars. There will be two, three, or four times the number of students. The university more than likely will have branches in the four corners of the State and spill over into neighboring towns of Leverett, Hadley, and make Amherst virtually a city with sessions over the 12 months of every year.

A century is a short time in the life of an institution, but happy birthday and a prosperous and progressive 100 years to come.

Combat Pay Is Right in Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, from a marine I received this morning the following brief but eloquent note:

Combat pay should not be taken away from the infantryman. Fliers get extra pay for doing their duty—other servicemen get hazardous duty pay for doing their job. I think sitting in a foxhole and being shot at is just as hazardous, don't you?

In a more formal manner I heard yesterday from the Department of Maryland Veterans of Foreign Wars as follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BENNETT: On behalf of our department officers, and 14,000 members in the Department of Maryland, Veterans of Foreign Wars, we wish to inform you that we are very much in support of additional combat pay for the military forces.

It is respectfully requested that when H.R. 5555 is brought up for consideration in the House, that you support an amendment that is expected to be offered to have combat pay be restored to this bill.

This is a "key objective" in the Department of Maryland, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and we sincerely hope that you will give assistance to having this amendment restored, as we know it will benefit our comrades-in-

May 7

A2834

arms who are maintaining the peace in this 17th year of the cold war.

Respectfully,

CHARLES A. KREATCHMAN,
Quartermaster/Adjutant.

Hostile fire pay, otherwise called combat pay, was paid to personnel in front line combat units in World War II and in the Korean war as a result of congressional action. Men in the U.S. armed services are dying and being wounded today in combat for our country. When the Department of Defense asked Congress this year to put combat pay in the pay bill now before us it said:

While combat is, of course, the basic purpose of a military establishment, the fact remains that the actual hazards and hardships of combat are currently experienced by a small percentage of the Armed Forces.

In approving \$55 per month to be paid, under strict regulations, the Department said:

It is, of course, impossible for the Government to compensate adequately for this kind of sacrifice or potential sacrifice, but it would give a token recognition of the special role being played by such personnel.

The Bureau of the Budget and the Special Subcommittee on Military Pay of the House Armed Services Committee approved this request.

The total annual extra pay for specified performances in the Military Establishment in addition to usual duty totals \$632,486,960, as shown in the report of the committee on H.R. 5555. The record shows that the cost of combat pay is estimated to be in the neighborhood only of \$1 or \$2 million annually, depending on the tightness of the regulations.

The committee in the Department of Defense which did the basic studies for this proposal made these conclusions:

(a) To provide special pay to individuals assigned to duties in which they are subject to the hazards and discomforts of combat is feasible, desirable, and consistent with the policy in the military service of awarding extra compensation for extra hazardous duties.

(b) Combat duty pay should be both an award for performing a hazardous and disagreeable duty and tangible recognition of performance of a necessary and sometimes heroic service. As such, payment should be rigidly administered and restricted to those individuals normally subjected to the hazards and discomforts of combat. Properly administered, it would improve the morale and effectiveness of the individuals assigned to duties in combat or quasi-combat conditions.

(c) It is impossible to assay the degree of risk one assumes when in a combat situation, or to equate the risk with monetary compensation. However, considering that Congress evaluated and approved \$45 per month 10 years ago, and that other hazardous duties authorize minimum payments of \$55 per month, that \$55 would be a proper amount.

(d) There is no discernible difference in the exposure to hazard and hardship experienced by officers and enlisted men, and therefore the additional pay awarded for combat duty should be equal.

(e) We have in the military service today, have had for most of the time since the Korean war, and will likely continue to have individuals performing duty under combat conditions suffering all the hazards and discomforts of such duty.

(f) The combat pay bill of 1952, while still on the statutes, is not operative because it applies only to units engaged in the Korean war.

Although this hostile fire pay is not restricted to infantry this is where the chief impact will be felt. And so it should be. When the infantryman is committed to action he knows that he will be there until the issue is decided one way or another or until he is killed, seriously wounded, or breaks mentally from the strain. Casualty data indicates that at the end of the first 100 days in combat—not necessarily consecutive—one-half of his friends with whom he entered combat will be missing in action, in a hospital, or dead. At the end of 200 days in combat, 93 percent of his buddies will be gone. For all practical purposes, 200 days in front line combat as an infantryman amounts to either a death sentence or a future as a mentally or physically handicapped man.

Opposition to IATA Transatlantic Fare Rises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 1, 1963, I issued a statement supporting the Civil Aeronautics Board's opposition to the attempt by the International Air Transport Association—IATA—to impose a 5-percent increase on jet economy round-trip fares for transatlantic air passengers and all Pacific services. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include this statement, which follows:

I heartily endorse the Civil Aeronautics Board's determination that the 5-percent transatlantic round-trip fare increase now sought by IATA is not in the public interest. I support the CAB's steadfast opposition to the efforts of IATA to force such an increase upon transatlantic air passengers.

The proposed fare increase does not make business sense with transatlantic jets flying half empty.

Furthermore, American citizens from a majority of the transatlantic air passengers, although U.S.-flag airlines now carry only about one-third of this traffic. Accordingly, such a transatlantic fare increase would take money from the pockets of American passengers and place the lion's share in the hands of foreign airlines.

I am fortified in this view by the statement, reported in today's New York Times, of Sir William Hildred, director general of IATA, who called for lower airline fares, which, he emphasized, would bring more passengers flocking to the jet airliners and make the operation of these planes profitable.

I welcome Sir William's latest statement, which is a far cry from the position he took during the 1956 hearings on the airlines industry before the Antitrust Subcommittee.

"The Antitrust Subcommittee's report of April 5, 1957, chronicles the struggles of the CAB to obtain reasonable, cost-justified international airline fares against the stubborn opposition of IATA. The subcommittee's report concluded:

"From the Board's own description of its experience over a decade of IATA ratemaking it is manifest that resulting rates are . . . unwarrantably high."

The Antitrust Subcommittee's 1957 report on the airlines industry further concluded that Congress should empower the CAB to regulate international airline fares to the same extent as domestic fares.

I am gratified to note that the statement on international air transport policy approved by President Kennedy only last week, likewise endorsed such legislation. The White House statement on international air transport policy expressly states:

"To provide for more effective governmental influence on rates, Congress should adopt legislation which would give the Civil Aeronautics Board authority, subject to approval by the President, to control rates in international air transport to and from the United States."

This recommendation mirrors the proposals of the Antitrust Subcommittee's 1957 airlines industry report which concluded:

"The committee accordingly joins with the Board, the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Air Coordinating Committee in endorsing the grant of legislative authority to the CAB to control the fares, rates, rules, and practices of U.S. carriers applicable to the transportation to and from the United States to the same extent that the Board now has power to act with respect to fares, rates, rules and practices in domestic transportation. The committee also endorses their recommendation that the Board receive greater legislative authorization to control the fares, rates, rules and practices of foreign air carriers applicable to transportation to and from the United States."

It is gratifying, therefore, to find the CAB protecting the public interest and forfending against the imposition by IATA, an international airline cartel, of air-fare increases which make no sense economically at a time of overcapacity, and which would in effect tax American transatlantic air passengers largely for the benefit of foreign airlines.

Bull file
Steuben Society of America Urges Establishment of a National Academy of Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Steuben Society of America has long been interested in the establishment of a National Academy of Foreign Affairs. Recently the society's legislative committee, consisting of Robert F. Holoch, chairman of the Steuben Society's National Public Affairs Committee, and Julius E. Mayer and George Wilkens, members of the National Council of the Steuben Society of America, prepared a brief in support of the Steuben Society's position. I include the full text of that brief:

NATIONAL COUNCIL,
STEBUEN SOCIETY OF AMERICA,
New York, N.Y.

To the Congress of the United States of America, House of Representatives and U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations:

GENTLEMEN: For many years, the Steuben Society of America has promoted and recom-

mended the establishment of a National Academy of Foreign Affairs similar to the three military academies we already have, namely, the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis, and the U.S. Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs.

In the platform of this society for 1962-64, it was recommended that we advocate the establishment of a Foreign Service Academy and our society's monthly newspaper, the Steuben News, has recommended annually the establishment of such an Academy and has enlightened its members as to the advantages of such an institution for the training of men and women for work in all phases of our foreign affairs.

This society has noted that the President of the United States has recommended and Members of the Congress have also introduced bills again in 1963 for the establishment of such an Academy and many Members of the Congress have concurred in such action.

Our great country has failed in the past to encourage and develop men and women for the purpose of training them as specialists in the foreign service field while many of our adversaries and friends throughout the world have, on the other hand, given their citizens intensive training in the field of foreign affairs. There have been established in our country various private institutions of learning which have tried to supplement such a program but the time has already passed when our National Government should undertake this most important project. A training in foreign affairs is just as important as the training of men in the Armed Forces. The future leaders of our foreign services should have their basic preparation in such an Academy.

Such an Academy should be established and developed by the Federal Government under such policies as Congress should direct. It is felt, however, that the Academy should be headed by a Chancellor who will direct, with the advice of a Board of Trustees or Directors composed of learned citizens, the curriculum and the training to be given to such an institution. Our country is deeply involved in maintaining peace and security of all the people of the world. Those who handle foreign affairs, especially in an advisory capacity, or otherwise, should make this their life's work and this needed training at such an Academy, as has been suggested not only by the President of the United States but by various Members of the Congress, would give to these individuals a background and educational understanding which would enable our Federal Government to staff its agencies handling those matters with competently trained and devoted individuals. Public servants working in the field of foreign service must, of necessity, have a very broad background as they become involved in programs in almost every field of national interest.

A National Academy of Foreign Affairs will result in the establishment of a first-rate institution which can grant these citizens who are most qualified to work in this field to receive the best possible training.

The Steuben Society of America urges the passage of such a bill, which will contain the proviso that the Chancellor of the said Academy be given directions only as to the policies of the said Academy by the Congress but that the curriculum and actual studies and phases of training of said Academy be left to its Board of Directors or Trustees and its Chancellor. The said Academy should be left free from any influence from any department of our Federal Government so that we can develop a corps of public servants in the foreign service second to none.

We pray that the Congress will take immediate action toward the passage of such an important piece of legislation.

Very truly yours,

OTTO HEERLEIN,
National Chairman.

Why Leave Out the Fighting Soldier?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 5555, which provides increases in pay for members of the Armed Forces, includes provisions for special and incentive pay for hazardous duty for hundreds of thousands of individuals at an annual cost of \$632,486,960. Despite the fact that the subcommittee which held hearings on this bill included extra pay for duty subject to hostile fire, this provision has been dropped from the reported bill.

I am including with these remarks a list of the types of duty which receive extra pay, the amount of the pay is shown, and a comparison of the Department of Defense proposal, H.R. 4696—the bill reported by the Rivers subcommittee, and H.R. 5555—the bill reported by the Armed Services Committee, is included. It is incredible that all of the special and hazardous duty pay categories were retained in H.R. 5555 except the small group of men subjected to hostile fire currently serving in southeast Asia.

An amendment is to be offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] to correct this inequitable situation and I believe that Members can readily see the extent of this gross injustice by reviewing the comparative chart which appears below:

INCENTIVE PAY FOR HAZARDOUS DUTY¹

Entitlement	Current (dollars per monthly)	DOD proposal (H.R. 3006)	H.R. 4696	H.R. 5555
a. Parachute duty:				
Officer.....	110	Retain.....	Retain.....	Retain.
Enlisted.....	55	do.....	do.....	Do.
b. Demolition duty:				
Officer.....	110	do.....	do.....	Do.
Enlisted.....	55	do.....	do.....	Do.
c. Flight duty (see enclosure): Crew member.				
Officer.....	110	do.....	do.....	Do.
Enlisted.....	55	do.....	do.....	Do.
d. Flight duty (noncrew):				
Officer.....	110	do.....	do.....	Do.
Enlisted.....	55	do.....	do.....	Do.
e. Thermal stress duty:				
Officer.....	110	do.....	do.....	Do.
Enlisted.....	55	do.....	do.....	Do.
f. Low pressure:				
Officer.....	110	Retain and add "high" pressure.	Retain and add "high" pressure.	Retain and add "high" pressure.
Enlisted.....	55	do.....	do.....	Do.
g. Submarine duty (see enclosure 1)				
Officer.....	110	Retain.....	Retain.....	Retain.
Enlisted.....	55	do.....	do.....	Do.
h. Leprosy:				
Officer.....	110	do.....	do.....	Do.
Enlisted.....	55	do.....	do.....	Do.
i. Glider flight duty:				
Officer.....	110	do.....	do.....	Do.
Enlisted.....	55	do.....	do.....	Do.
j. Human acceleration:				
Officer.....	110	do.....	do.....	Do.
Enlisted.....	110	do.....	do.....	Do.

SPECIAL PAY

a. Sea and foreign duty (enlisted only):				
E-9.....	\$22.50	Eliminate.....	\$22.50.....	\$22.50.
E-8.....	22.50	do.....	\$22.50.....	\$22.50.
E-7.....	22.50	do.....	\$22.50.....	\$22.50.
E-6.....	20.00	do.....	\$20.....	\$20.
E-5.....	16.00	do.....	\$16.....	\$16.
E-4.....	13.00	do.....	\$13.....	\$13.
E-3.....	9.00	do.....	\$9.....	\$9.
E-2.....	8.00	do.....	\$8.....	\$8.
E-1.....	8.00	do.....	\$8.....	\$8.
b. Medical and dental (officer):				
(1) Less than 2 years active duty.....	100	Retain.....	Retain.....	Retain.
(2) 2 to 6 years active duty.....	150	do.....	do.....	Do.
(3) 6 to 10 years active duty.....	200	do.....	do.....	Do.
(4) Over 10 years active duty.....	250	do.....	do.....	Do.
c. Veterinarians (officers)	100	do.....	do.....	Do.
d. Diving duty:				
Officer.....	100	do.....	do.....	Do.
Enlisted:				
Master diver.....	100	do.....	do.....	Do.
1st class diver.....	80	do.....	do.....	Do.
Salvage diver.....	65	do.....	do.....	Do.
2d class diver.....	55	do.....	do.....	Do.
e. Proficiency pay (enlisted only):				
P-1.....	30	do.....	do.....	Do.
P-2.....	60	do.....	do.....	Do.
f. Unusual responsibility: ²				
Colonel.....	150	Eliminate.....	Eliminate.....	Eliminate.
Lieutenant colonel.....	100	do.....	do.....	Do.
Major.....	50	do.....	do.....	Do.
Captain.....	50	do.....	do.....	Do.
g. Reenlistment bonus.....		do.....	Retain.....	Retain.
h. Career incentive.....	None	\$500 to \$2,400 dependent upon criticality of skill and as determined by Secretary of Defense.	Eliminate.....	Eliminate.
i. Duty subject to hostile fire.....	³ None	\$55.....	Retain.....	Do.

¹ Currently, a member is entitled, if otherwise qualified, to only one incentive pay for hazardous duty; H.R. 3006 and H.R. 4696 will authorize a maximum of two incentive pays for hazardous duty.

² Not implemented.

³ Combat Duty Pay Act of 1952 authorized \$45 per month for service in Korea.

A2836

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 7

College President Warns of the Danger of Federal Funds for Higher Education**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. PAUL FINDLEY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Federal aid to higher education by no means holds a universal appeal to college educators.

Dr. John A. Howard, president of Rockford College, Rockford, Ill., recently gave a speech in Chicago in which he warned educators interested in academic freedom of the dependence on Federal money.

The day may come when faculty members, at the mercy of Federal funds, will support the political party which promises them the largest amount of money regardless of other partisan differences.

Dr. Howard's speech "Stampede to Disaster," was reprinted in the April issue of Commerce. Excerpts are given here:

EXCERPTS FROM "STAMPEDE TO DISASTER"

We have witnessed overly hasty action in American agriculture, when the Federal Government without fully understanding the mechanism of our agricultural system, plunged into a program of remedies that has had such extraordinarily adverse consequences that nobody really knows how to undo or amend the cure and bring the patient back to health.

Now we are being rushed into ill-advised remedies for education which violate the nature and neutralize the vitality of the educational system that has ably served this country's needs under circumstances the most various.

REASONS FOR REJECTION

Now let us examine some of the reasons which underlie the traditional rejection of the Federal Government as the means of support for education. In the first place as the Federal Government becomes the largest single source of funds for college after college, and there are a number already in this category, the institution becomes beholden to the Government. This is not a chimera born of a doctrinaire distrust of Government. Recently I wrote to the president of a large well-known university inviting him to join a group of college presidents in making known the arguments against the ever-growing Federal subsidies of education. He replied that although he was in full agreement with our position that the subsidies are not in the long-range best interests of the colleges or the country, his own university was now so dependent upon funds from Washington that he could not exercise his rights as a citizen on this issue without jeopardizing the university he served.

Think about that answer, if you will. The mere flow of the money has silenced the opposition. This loss of freedom on the part of those who depend on Government for their income was the reason for refusing suffrage to the residents of the District of Columbia.

Let us protect the Federal aid programs ahead, not too many years the way things are going, to the time when all colleges and universities will receive the largest part of their budget from the United States Treasury. Is it possible that all faculty members in that day will feel some obligation to vote for whichever party promises

the largest amount of additional educational subsidies regardless of other partisan differences? This is not an unlikely result. Political freedom is sacrificed by those who depend upon Government resources. Can we afford to sacrifice the political freedom of the whole academic community?

Money is a good servant but a dangerous master. The reason that it is so difficult to justify Federal aid to education is that except for the few who admit to a philosophical commitment to the centralization of the services of society, the only justification for Federal aid is money, and the awkward, ugly fact is that the Federal Government is far more prodigal with its funds than are other sources.

If only the proponents of Federal aid would come right out and state this fact we could face the issue head on and measure what the easy money buys against what we must sacrifice in order to obtain it from Washington.

It is undeniable that our increasingly technical society requires an increasingly skilled and knowledgeable population and to accomplish this end a larger part of the gross national product must be invested in education.

The issue is whether this urgent objective is to be achieved through congressional action—which forces the people to pay more for education and at the same time diminishes the diversity and circumscribes the creativity of the separate colleges—or whether the Nation can be persuaded to provide the necessary funds through the traditional sources and thus preserve the freedom and the strength of American education.

The latter course takes hard work. Fund-raising is often a frustrating and thankless task, but no priceless asset is earned or retained without labor and sacrifice.

I cannot believe that my colleagues in college administration would so readily forfeit the full potential of their respective institutions, nor would shirk the task of local financing if they fully realized what was at stake. As black as their financial future may appear to them, it cannot be the reason for abandoning integrity. The course of educational statesmanship is to protect the greatest creative potential and the greatest institutional individuality. I don't believe that course lies via the Federal Treasury.

The college executives and the officers of government who may have a part through their silent or vocal support of Federal subsidy will have to answer to history for the consequences of their work.

Pay for Old Soldiers**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the May 5, 1963, issue of the Washington Sunday Star, entitled "Pay for Old Soldiers," is worth the consideration of all Members of the House prior to the vote tomorrow on the military pay bill.

PAY FOR OLD SOLDIERS

Until 4 years ago, military retirement pay was based on active duty pay scales for each rank. The 1958 Pay Act, which sharply adjusted active duty rates, ditched the traditional retirement formula, and allowed those who had turned in their uniforms before the passage of the act only a 6-percent cost-of-living increase. Those who retired later, of course, started from the higher base of their

active duty pay—creating a double standard which was inequitable to the older soldiers.

Now, in its new pay bill, the House Armed Services Committee has voted to perpetuate that injustice by refusing to permit the old retirees to recompute their retirement on the basis of the 1958 pay rates. This action flies in the face of a strong recommendation to the contrary by the Defense Department. It overturns a unanimous action of its own subcommittee. Finally, it constitutes an out-and-out reversal of policy by the full committee itself, which waged a strong fight and actually won House approval for the re-computation provision in 1960. Its report attempts to justify this latest action on the basis of excessive cost.

This was not a valid argument in 1958. It was not valid in 1960, when the House action was thwarted by a recalcitrant Senate. And it has no validity today—as a means of avoiding equal treatment. The issue involved is whether there should be a uniform rate for all retirees. We think there should be.

**Federal Equality of Opportunity in
Employment Act****EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. JACOB H. GILBERT**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement to the General Subcommittee on Labor, on the vital problem of discrimination in employment, in which I urged the committee to take favorable action on legislation under consideration which would provide complete coverage and assure equal employment opportunity to all citizens of our country. My statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the General Subcommittee on Labor, you have under consideration legislation to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry. I am gratified to have the opportunity to speak on this legislation; in January of this year, I reintroduced my bill—H.R. 330—a "Federal Equality of Opportunity in Employment Act" and I have introduced such legislation ever since coming to Congress.

In my opinion, civil rights and equality of opportunity in employment are the most vital issues which we face on the home front today, and inasmuch as the Emancipation Proclamation was signed 100 years ago, it is high time that we stop being laggards and that we proceed, with alacrity, to do the job that should have been done generations ago.

The malicious, destructive, discriminatory practices which now abound in all fields of employment throughout our country, affecting millions of our people, must be brought to an abrupt halt. We must not continue to ignore the terrible degradation suffered by those who are victims of discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national ancestry, for this anguish is visited upon their children and continues on and on. All hope is killed in the very young; they know that although they have a high degree of intelligence, are ambitious and industrious, there is no point in pursuing higher education or looking for jobs which we commensurate with their abilities; they are not given such jobs, they know that they will be denied advancements to which they are entitled in any jobs they hold, because